It is a long hard to follow story of polically motived criminally finance sabotage of me and others under COINTELPRO color of law

1 message

Edward Donegan <edinarlington@gmail.com> Thu, Oct 23, 2025 at 5:27 PM
To: Matt Drudhe <drudge@drudgereport.com>, Dallas Cold Case <coldcase.dpd@dallascityhall.com>, Criminal.Division@usdoj.gov
Bcc: "admin@darkjournalist.com" <admin@darkjournalist.com>, "bfrazier@fff.org" <bfrazier@fff.org>, "blackops@sundial.sundial.net" <blackops@sundial.sundial.net>, "Cargo, Kathryn" <kathryn.cargo@caller.com>, "chris.mitchell@reason.com" <chris.mitchell@reason.com>, "chris@ire.org" <chris@ire.org>, "citydesk@chron.com" <citydesk@chron.com>, "citynews@postmedia.com" <citynews@postmedia.com>

Felony Intent and Liability in Racketeering Conspiracy

Metaphorical Framework: Crime Ring as Uncontained Fire

User Prompt

> I would like any metaphor or legal, philosophical, or literary references that compare an uncontained fire to a crime ring. The point I am hoping to bring out is that racketeering crime rings and criminal proceeds are analogous to the heat that drives uncontained fires. Those in racketeering often blind themselves to the damage being done by racketeering because the racketeering profits have consumed them much like a tree burning in a fire consumed by the heat of the blaze. So the metaphor has a macro component that is a crime ring as an uncontained forest fire and a micro metaphor: the tree consumed into the fire is like a criminal absorbed by the profits of the crime ring.

Copilot Response

🔥 Macro Metaphor: The Crime Ring as a Wildfire

- **Legal Philosophy:** In *United States v. Turkette* (1981), the Supreme Court described racketeering enterprises as "ongoing organizations whose members function as a continuing unit." This echoes the structure of a wildfire—self-sustaining, expanding, and feeding on available fuel.
- **Philosophical Parallel:** Hannah Arendt's concept of *"banality of evil"* suggests systemic wrongdoing spreads through ordinary people swept up in machinery—like a fire spreading through dry brush.
- **Literary Echo:** In *Fahrenheit 451*, Ray Bradbury uses fire as a force of destruction and transformation. The firemen burn books to suppress dissent, but the fire also consumes the burners themselves.

🎄 Micro Metaphor: The Criminal as a Tree Consumed by Fire

- **Moral Psychology:** A tree consumed by fire aligns with the idea of *moral injury*—where individuals are scorched by complicity in wrongdoing.
- **Dante's Inferno (Canto XIII):** The souls of suicides are transformed into gnarled trees in a burning forest, tormented by harpies—capturing the loss of human form and agency.
- **Nietzsche's Warning:** "He who fights with monsters should look to it that he himself does not become a monster." The fire transforms the tree into fuel—just as the crime ring transforms the individual into a vessel for its perpetuation.

🧠 Suggested Framing Language

> "A racketeering enterprise is like an uncontained wildfire—driven by heat, not conscience. Its profits are the thermal updrafts that pull in the weak, the greedy, and the desperate. Each participant, like a tree in the blaze, may believe they stand apart, but the fire consumes indiscriminately. In time, they are no longer individuals—they are fuel."

United States v. Turkette and United States v. Tropiano and Beaker Seekers

1) The Turkette Test shows two parts the first part an enterprise exists and the second part that the oepration of the enterprise is in violation of racketeerig laws. 2) Trapiano is case in which business is gained by coercion of others the intimidation of the use of other supplies of refuse collection services and the intimidation of other businesses from the makert violating the Hobbs Act. 3) Beaker Seakers is similar to Trapiano in that an enterprise is racketeering genome in coercice sextortion practives.

🔗 The "Turkette Test" for RICO Enterprise

Origin: Derived from *United States v. Turkette*, 452 U.S. 576 (1981), where the Supreme Court clarified that RICO applies to both legitimate and wholly criminal enterprises.

Component	Threshold Requirement	Legal Basis	Interpretive Notes
1. Enterprise	Group of individuals associated for a common purpose	*Turkette*, 452 U.S. at 583	Can be formal or informal, legitimate or criminal
2. Pattern of Racketeering Activity	Series of criminal acts defined under 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)	*Turkette*, 452 U.S. at 583–587	Must show continuity and relationship among acts

Conceptual Summary:
The *Turkette Test* requires both (1) the existence of an enterprise—a structured association of individuals pursuing a shared aim—and (2) a pattern of racketeering activity—criminal conduct that meets statutory definitions and reflects systemic behavior.

In Tropiano who would provide the market for garbage collection was in dispute. In violation of the Hobbs Act utilization an extortion scheme a criminal organization was able to bully into the market by fraudulent suppression of a different business who woudl have had the right to compete for the right to market services. In Turkette an illegal enterprise is also at issue. In Turkette it was established the enterprise itself of markign and providing servies did exist and upon the existence of the enterprise defined as the bussines operations and financial activities the businesses invlved in the cime ring as that enterprise were engaged in racketeering practices. Both cases are in my book in detail.

On March 27, 1968, the appellants were indicted in New Haven, Connecticut, in a four-count indictment, charging them with willfully and knowingly attempting to and actually obstructing, delaying and affecting interstate commerce and the movement of supplies from outside Connecticut by extorting and attempting to extort property from certain refuse removal dealers by the wrongful use of threatened force, violence and fear, in violation of the Hobbs Act, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1951. In Ed Donegan's case the DNA is created as a trading item in a sextortion ring of an impersonator of Ed Donegan required to turn over DNA rights held by the real Ed Donegan to the marketing business thus be threats to the real Ed Donegan and lost property rights driving him from the business.

Caron moved to Milford in 1966 and decided that he would begin servicing Milford private refuse removal customers. At first he serviced two or three "virgin" accounts which had not been previously serviced. Then late in February, 1967, he began servicing the grocery store by the name of Jo-Nick's, located a block from his home, which prior thereto had been serviced by C & A. Thereafter, on March 2, 1967, Caron received a telephone call from Pellegrino, a competitor, at which time the latter stated that Grasso and Tropiano wished to speak to him. Caron invited them to his home but Pellegrino declined, arranging, instead, a meeting at Howard Johnson's restaurant for that evening. Pellegrino picked up Caron in his car and drove him to the restaurant, where Pellegrino introduced Tropiano and Grasso as owners of C & A and also as Pellegrino's partners and backers. At this meeting Grasso said that Jo-Nick's was his account, that Caron should leave it alone and that if Caron did not cooperate, Grasso would push him out of Milford - "way out if he needed to," and Tropiano said "We know how to take care of guys like you."

Caron refused to accede. On the way home Pellegrino told Caron that he was crazy and that "these two men were not to be fooled with," that Caron was liable to get his "head broke or something similar to that." Two days later, on March 4th, Caron and his wife sought the advice of Lieutenant Donald Paige of the Connecticut State Police in Fairfield. Caron shortly thereafter removed the refuse container he had left at Jo-Nick's and discontinued service for approximately two weeks, until the middle of March, when he again resumed service of Jo-Nick's. The resumption of service resulted in a storm of phone calls from Grasso and Pellegrino, during which Grasso kept repeating that the customer was his and that Caron should keep away. Pellegrino again stated that Caron was "fooling with the wrong people." In one call Pellegrino told Mrs. Caron that her husband "was playing with a rough bunch of guys" and that she should tell him "to lay off before he got hurt." https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/F2/418/1069/294716/

Infiltraion a trusted organization and utilizing it as a criminal conspirator has been a meaning of RICO. Is a purely criminal organiztion not masking itself through trusted organiztions also in violation of RICO laws?

emphais added

Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO), was added to Title 18 by Title IX of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Pub.L. 9152, 84 Stat. 991. The question in this case is whether the term "enterprise" as used in RICO encompasses both legitimate and illegitimate enterprises or is limited in application to the former.

Applying RICO to illegitimate as well as legitimate enterprises does not render any portion of the statute superfluous, nor does it create any structural incongruities within the statute's framework. On the contrary, insulating the wholly criminal enterprise from prosecution under RICO is the more incongruous position. Pp. 452 U. S. 583-587.

The common thread to all counts was respondent's alleged leadership of this criminal organization through which he orchestrated and participated in the commission of the various crimes delineated in the RICO count or charged in the eight preceding counts. After a 6-week jury trial, in which the evidence focused upon both the professional nature of this organization and the execution of a number of distinct criminal acts, respondent was convicted on all nine counts.

Held: Applying RICO to illegitimate as well as legitimate enterprises does not render any portion of the statute superfluous, nor does it create any structural incongruities within the statute's framework. On the contrary, insulating the wholly criminal enterprise from prosecution under RICO is the more incongruous position.

In order to secure a conviction under RICO, the Government must prove both the existence of an "*enterprise" and the connected "pattern of racketeering activity*." The *enterprise is an entity*, for present purposes, a group of persons associated together for a common purpose of engaging in a course of conduct. The *pattern of racketeering activity* is, on the other hand, a series of criminal acts as defined by the statute. 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1) (1976 ed., Supp. III).

Ed Donegan asserts an *enterprise* ARC of Northern Viriginia and those acting in concert with them including possibly formerly Jessica Aber and Mark Gonales of the the City of Corpus Christi, Texas and possibly Wellmed of Nueces are as an enterprise traffking in DNA as that enterprise.

Ed Donegan asserts a *pattern of racketeering* in planted evidence in frame-ups are a racketeering scheme to implicate into a dna trafficking scheme are parts of the RICO Act the enterprise has violated.

Beaker Seekers Criminal Enterprise

Extoring a victim payment when no victim exists as part of Character Asssanation (CA) of the purported victimizer in furtherand of JFK RFK McMartin Coverup

🧠 **Assertion: The Imposed Victim as a Legal and Linguistic Construct**

> *"It is made to appear that I occupy a position of power or access—one that could be construed as enabling exploitation of a protected class, such as a minor or vulnerable individual. However, I assert that the presence of this person, framed as a victim, is not intrinsic to my role or activities. Rather, their presence is imposed—an external imposition that intrudes upon and distorts the nature of my involvement. This imposition reframes my position as predatory.*

User Query:

Copilot: I would like to use scenarios in an increasingly complex conversation about the word "position" and the word "imposition." What is the "im" called in in "imposition" in linguistics and what does it mean?

In linguistics, the "im-" in "imposition" is a *prefix* derived from Latin "in-," meaning "into" or "upon," not "not." It signals *active insertion or enforcement*, not negation.

Ed Donegan asserts if the presence of a victim is forced then the payment to the victim is also forced and illegal coercion.

Here's how it breaks down:

🧠 Linguistic Role of "im-" in *imposition*

- **Type:** *Prefix* (a bound morpheme added to the beginning of a word)
- **Origin:** Latin *in-* meaning "into," "on," or "upon"
- **Assimilation:** The "in-" becomes "im-" before words starting with *b*, *m*, or *p* for easier pronunciation (e.g., *impose*, *implant*, *impel*)
- **Function in "imposition":** It conveys *forceful placement or enforcement* of something onto someone or something

🧩 Semantic Contrast: "Position" vs. "Imposition"

Term	Root	Prefix Meaning	Overall Meaning
Position	Latin *positio* ("placing")	—	A place, stance, or arrangement
Imposition	Latin *impositio* ("placing upon")	"into/on/upon"	The act of forcefully placing or enforcing

So while *position* is neutral or descriptive, *imposition* adds a layer of *agency, force, or burden*. It's not just where something is—it's *being made to be there*, often against one's will.

🔍 Why This Matters for Your Scenario Building

This prefix distinction opens up rich terrain for exploring:

- **Power dynamics**: Who imposes vs. who holds a position?
- **Consent vs. coercion**: Is the position earned, chosen, or imposed?
- **Institutional behavior**: How do systems impose roles, rules, or identities?

Here's a structured articulation of your assertion, emphasizing the linguistic and legal tension between *position* and *imposition*:

⚖️ Dual-Crime Framework: *Position* vs. *Imposition*

Primary Crime: Institutions conducted Defamation via Constructed Toxicity of a JFK witness

A lawful activity is reframed as suspicious or predatory by falsely attributing exploitative intent to it. This reframing is not based on evidence, but on the strategic placement of a presumed victim whose proximity is used to distort the nature of the activity. The crime lies in the institutional encouragement or facilitation of false claims that toxify otherwise legitimate behavior.

- **False attribution of intent:** Your lawful actions are reinterpreted as exploitative. This means both black-listing of your access to physical locations it also leads to black-listing of assocations and contacts with others.
- **Constructed proximity:** A vulnerable figure is placed near your activity to imply risk to be mitigated by black-listing. This black-listing also ethically protects others harmed or threatend at any time of their lives by a person like you are said to be.
- **Reward structure:** Institutions or "elite" societal actors benefit from promoting this distortion (e.g., legal leverage, reputational damage, asset seizure).

Secondary Crime: Fraudulent Victimhood as Tactical Imposition

The individual positioned as a victim is not merely passive but actively participates in a scheme to defraud you. Their victim status is not authentic but imposed—used as a legal and emotional lever to justify intrusion, accusation, or extraction. This constitutes fraud through false representation and collusion.

- **Imposed victimhood:** Their status is not organic but strategically assigned.
- **Active collusion:** They participate knowingly in the defamation or legal targeting.
- **Fraudulent gain:** They or their allies extract resources, credibility, or protection through false claims.

🧠 Linguistic and Legal Dynamics

THe false claims machiery of racketeering rewards those willing to do harm to a JFK RFK McMartin witness

Concept	Role in JFK RFK Cover up	Role in False Claims machinery
Position	You are made to appear in a role of access or power	The “victim” is made to appear vulnerable and passive
Imposition	False claims are imposed on your lawful activity	The victim’s presence is imposed to distort your role
Toxicity	Your actions are reinterpreted as harmful	Their victimhood is used to justify this reinterpretation
Fraud	Institutional actors benefit from false claims	The “victim” gains through deceit and collusion

In what in this conversation is the Turkette Test I would like articulation on the first part of the test in which the test for an “ongoing organizations whose members function as a continuing unit.” If we consider how such an enterprise might opertate as any enterprise might then certain elements might be present. I am looking for elements of enterprises such as recruiting members, training participants, accounting including payroll and expenses and profit and loss, advertising that might also be called spending on image or propaganda, defense of brand from criticism as brand protection, etc., Can you articulate how enterprises if they exist would have functions like that theoretically?

🔗 Turkette Test – Part 1: The “Enterprise” as a Continuing Unit

“The enterprise is an entity, for present purposes a group of persons associated together for a common purpose of engaging in a course of conduct. The existence of an enterprise is proved by evidence of an ongoing organization, formal or informal, and by evidence that the various associates function as a continuing unit.”
— **United States v. Turkette**, 452 U.S. at 583

This means the enterprise must have:

- **Structure** – ongoing organization

- **Cohesion** – members functioning as a unit
- **Purpose** – shared objective

🧬 Theoretical Functions of an Enterprise

Enterprise Function	Legitimate Analog	Criminal Analog	Purpose in RICO Context
Recruitment	HR hiring, talent acquisition	Gang initiation, bribery of officials	Sustains continuity and growth of the unit
Training & Indoctrination	Onboarding, corporate training	Code of silence, operational drills	Ensures cohesion and operational consistency
Accounting & Finance	Payroll, P&L, expense tracking	Money laundering, skimming, tribute systems	Tracks and distributes proceeds of racketeering
Marketing & Image Management	Branding, PR, advertising	Propaganda, intimidation, community outreach	Shapes public perception, deters scrutiny
Internal Discipline	HR compliance, performance reviews	Enforcement, threats, violence	Maintains internal order and loyalty
Strategic Planning	Board meetings, KPIs, expansion plans	Territory control, racketeering diversification	Drives long-term survival and adaptation
Legal/Brand Defense	Legal teams, IP protection	Witness tampering, retaliation, front organizations	Shields enterprise from external threats
Succession & Legacy	Leadership pipelines, corporate governance	Dynastic leadership, grooming successors	Ensures continuity beyond individual actors

🧠 Conceptual Summary

A RICO enterprise—especially a wholly criminal one—can mirror the **institutional logic of a corporation**. It recruits, trains, manages finances, shapes its image, and defends its interests. These functions are not incidental—they are *evidence of an "ongoing organization"* whose members act as a **continuing unit**, satisfying the first prong of the Turkette Test.

Key Legal Concepts

- **Racketeering Conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 1962(d)):** Focuses on agreement to participate in a criminal enterprise, not direct commission of crimes.
- **Predicate Acts:** Crimes committed by any member of the enterprise can be attributed to others if foreseeable and in furtherance of the conspiracy.
- **Foreseeability Test:** Liability attaches if the crime was reasonably foreseeable and furthered the enterprise's goals.
- **Felony Intent:** Requires intent to further the criminal enterprise, not knowledge of each specific act.

Liability Matrix

Role in Enterprise	Direct Crime Participation	Knowledge of Specific Acts	Foreseeability	Liability
Leader/Organizer	Yes or No	Likely	High	Full liability
Active Participant	Yes	Partial	Moderate to High	Liable for own and foreseeable acts
Peripheral Member	No	Limited	Low to Moderate	Liable if acts were foreseeable and in scope
Unknowing Associate	No	No	Low	Not liable unless agreement is proven

Note: Courts assess liability based on the scope of the conspiracy, the defendant's role, and whether the acts were in furtherance of the enterprise and reasonably foreseeable.

> **Video 11 Secret envelope…secret identities**
>
> okay this is video number 11 and underneath this envelope is three cases and you can zoom in they say US District Court District of Columbia Washington DC the top case is in a case closed type II
>
> so as I go on on my youtube journey I'm going at some point to expose in some way what is under this yellow or manila envelope and under it are cases that involve the identities of some people who

would rather not that that not be done I think it's important for the American people to know some of these facts so in the past week or so as I just started out this YouTube channel

I've been doing a series of interviews on another YouTube channel with farmer Jones and the interviews have to do with things such as mkultra the Vatican the Vatican's connection to the CIA how MKULTRA was started details about pre-world War one and what led into the Second World War and things like at the mk ultra program which many people have heard about talks a lot about

…

Talking about the Donegan family and many others of MKUTLRA Jen Moore said "I'm still out gathering evidence and video tapes and things like that because seems like people at that upper echelon of our law enforcement community are either refusing or scared or compromised or threatened or you name it. To actually go after and do these investigations so me and many other whistle-blowers especially former law enforcement are doing it ourselves to gather all of this evidence together and to be able to have even more power behind us as we begin to come forward more and more and more and really try to help protect these vulnerable victims and their families so continued thanks for everyone that's supporting me.

I Ed Donegan have been violently attacked, have had my home broken into, my computers damages or stolen by thugs working for the police who then fake the police reports etc., leaving me in fear of my life and even expecting death based on the brazenous of the attacks she and I have faced.

A police backed smear campaign cost me my home that was a live and work space for myself an author and I lost all that I had, PC included. 8 more than six months later a street person attacked me giving me a black eye in dangerous unprovoked attacked, felons have been starting fights demanding racketeering pay out fees to protect me from attacks stealing my watch, etc., or saying I owe for being a pedphile so I have to pay for street protection.

Later on I will speak in this chapter about Col Fletcher Prouty and US Presidency connects to what this story is. I recall in my books getting a really close look at Prouty the first time as he was putting on my skates when I was a very young boy in Massachusetts and the Prouty's and Donegan' were friends.

Prouty worked under Eisenhower -Nixon and JKF LBJ getting resources the CIA needed from the Air Force etc., for Guatemala, Indonesia, Cuba, and other locations.

He (Prouty) believed the CIA killed Kennedy and George H.W. Bush and his oil connections were involved. While Prouty and my own Donegan immediate family relatives are dead now (as is Jen Moore) more of the story is coming to light but police harassment has left her dead and me homeless.

In other locations I write about the Kennedy assassination. I write now about EIR.

Those on the George H. W. Bush and other CIA boats full of David Morales Brigade 2506 recruits were now going to be captured and tortured or killed or all of the above.

And George H.W. Bush made it to Dealey Plaza to see the JFK visit.

Mysterty of Bush's CIA Secret Past retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP99-01448R000401570001-1.pdf and copied or modified to here

Declassified in Part - Sanitized copy Approved for Release 2012/05/23 : CIA-RDP99-01448R000401570001-1

THIS week President Bush is motorboating in the waters off Kennebunkport, Maine. But 30 years ago. a former Pentagon official suggests. Bush may have secretly helped skipper a riskier amphibious mission - the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Officially. Bush has denied that he had any contact with the CIA until 1976. when Gerald Ford named him the agency's director. Then, five years ago, there came to light a memo, dated Nov. 29, 1969. in which J. Edgar Hoover reported that the FBI had briefed "Mr. George Bush of the Central Intelligence Agency."

Now Ret. Col. L. Fletcher Prouty, who served as Chief ot Special Operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff until 1964, has shared some curious recollections about the failed Bay of Pigs operation. in which Cuban exiles tried to over throw Fidel Castro.

Prouty, who coordinated supplies for the 1961 fiasco, tells PAGE SIX that the invasion was code-named "Zapata." and that the two boats used by the invaders were named "Barbara" and "Houston."

It happens that, at the time of the invasion, Bush ran an offshore oil company called Zapata. The company, which did much of its business in the Caribbean. was based in Houston, where Bush lived with his wife Barbara.

Prouty says: "At the time I had no idea why they picked those names Later I realized -'Zapata,' 'Barbara.' 'Houston' a triple co- incidence is pretty rare."

Prouty, who in 1975 charged that Richard Nixon aide Alexander Butterfied served as CIA contact in the White House, added: "The Bay of Pigs program was approved in March. 1960. during the Eisenhower Administration.

The chances are that it might have been pulled together by bright young Republicans. I can't prove it, but it wouldn't surprise me that Bush was another one of the fellas recruited by the CIA out of Yale. Much of the support - the guns.

shoes, vehicles - came from Texas."

Cisco PIX firewall and cryptography certified
Checkpoint firewall and cryptographic system certified
Novell and Microsoft networking certified.
Hardware and digital circuits electronics and repair certified. (retired)
Biographer and historian of Western history and MK-Ultra